arXiv:1403.6870v1 [cs.MS] 26 Mar 2014

A modified ziggurat algorithm for generating exponentially- and normally-distributed pseudorandom numbers

Christopher D McFarland[a*]
[a] *Program in Biophysics, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA*

March 28, 2014

Abstract

The Ziggurat Algorithm is a very fast rejection sampling method for generating PseudoRandom Numbers (PRNs) from common statistical distributions. The algorithm divides a distribution into rectangular layers that stack on top of each other (resembling a Ziggurat), subsuming the desired distribution. Random values within these rectangular layers are then sampled by rejection. This implementation splits layers into two types: those constituting the majority that fall completely under the distribution and can be sampled extremely fast without a rejection test, and a few additional layers that encapsulate the fringe of the distribution and require a rejection test. This method offers speedups of 65% for exponentially- and 82% for normally-distributed PRNs when compared to the best available C implementations of these generators. Even greater speedups are obtained when the algorithm is extended to the Python and MATLAB/OCTAVE programing environments.

1 Introduction

Random numbers are essential for a variety of applications: the modeling of natural systems, optimization, and cryptography, to name a few. However, computers are designed to behave deterministically, thus making truly random number generation from a computer often difficult, and sometimes impossible. PseudoRandom Numbers (PRNs), or deterministic random numbers, are generally used as a reasonable substitute for truly random numbers. Because of their wide-range of applications, PRNs have a long history of study. PRN Generators (PRNGs) most often work by transforming an initial single random number, or 'seed', into a new PRN, and then using the new PRN to seed a transformation into the next PRN. While the transformation algorithm in PRNGs is deterministic, it nevertheless satisfies important properties of truly random numbers, such as large periodicity, equidistribution and discontinuity [1]. Most current PRNGs output uniformly-distributed values. These uniformly-distributed PRNs are then transformed into other sampling distributions by downstream algorithms. Often, this transformation takes significantly greater time than the initial uniform PRNG, thus constituting the primary bottleneck of some stochastic algorithms.

The Ziggurat Algorithm is the most commonly used method to obtain non-uniformly-distributed PRNs. It was first proposed in the early 60's [2] and has since been modified many times [3, 4, 5], currently being among the fastest method available on modern CPUs [3], although other fast methods exist [6]. The algorithm works via rejection sampling, a three-step process for generating random numbers. (1) The desired probability distribution $P(x)$ is subsumed by a set of boxes, resembling a ziggurat. The design of these boxes is described below. (2) Two uniform PRNs are used to define a point (x, y) within a randomly chosen box. (3) If this point lies beneath the desired probability distribution, i.e. if $y < P(x)$, then the x coordinate is returned; otherwise the point is 'rejected' and a new point (x, y) is selected and tested.

*Corresponding author. Email: mcfarlan@fas.harvard.edu

Here, we present a modified Ziggurat Algorithm that creates rectangular layers which lie completely beneath $P(x)$ [as opposed to completely containing $P(x)$]. This eliminates the need to sample these layers by rejection, but also leaves short gaps of probability mass that must be sampled in a small minority of iterations. By eliminating the need to rejection sample most PRNs and by sampling these small gaps of probability mass efficiently, exponentially- and normally-distributed PRN generation is greatly accelerated. In the next section, the modified algorithm is described in detail alongside the traditional ziggurat method. I then discuss timings of the algorithm in comparison to the best alternative algorithms and demonstrate a considerable speedup. In the appendix, I present the code, affirm the random properties of the generated distributions, and discuss additional minor optimizations that further improved performance.

2 Description of the algorithm

As detailed above, a uniform PRNG is utilized as an input source of randomness for the Ziggurat Method. Here, I use a popular Mersenne Twister algorithm [7] to generate uniform PRNs, however this generator can be easily substituted in the provided code. The Mersenne Twister used runs very fast and exhibits excellent randomness, making it ideal for use in most applications excluding cryptography.

In a ziggurat algorithm, the desired probability distribution $P(x)$ lies beneath a stack of rectangular layers. Layers are designed such that they all contain the exact same area, thus each box is randomly chosen with equal probability to ensure uniform coverage of $P(x)$. The box is randomly chosen in each iteration of sampling, via a random integer i. The height f_i and length X_i of each ziggurat layer are pre-calculated in lookup tables. Because of these lookup tables, ziggurat algorithms are most efficiently implemented on systems with large caches (e.g. modern CPUs, but not current GPUs) [8].

Ziggurat algorithms accelerate computation because the vast majority of points within the ziggurat layers reside in regions that are a priori guaranteed to lie beneath $P(x)$ [3, 5] (Figure 1). Avoiding sampling by rejection greatly accelerates the algorithm because many probability distributions are transcendental and, thus, require many operations to calculate $P(x)$. In the traditional exponentially-distributed ziggurat algorithm, greater than 3% of the distribution will be rejection tested when the number of ziggurat layers N_{layers} is 256 [3].

$P(x)$ often contains a tail that resides outside of the ziggurat layers. Sampling from this tail can always be achieved via Inverse Transform Sampling [9]. However, for certain probability distributions faster approaches are possible. In general, the ziggurat algorithm is ideal for distributions where sampling from the tail is rare.

The modified ziggurat algorithm presented here differs from the traditional algorithm in one key manner: layers lie completely beneath $P(x)$, whereas in the traditional algorithm layers completely subsume $P(x)$ (Figure 1). This modification completely eliminates the need for any rejection test within the ziggurat layers, however it leaves small gaps of probability mass to the right of layers that I will describe how to sample efficiently below.

To lie completely beneath the desired distribution, ziggurat layers must extend until their *upper-right* corner coincides with $P(x)$ (in the traditional ziggurat algorithm, their lower-right corner touches $P(x)$). Hence, the position of this corner is $(X_i, f_i = P(X_i))$, where X_i is the length of each layer. Like the traditional ziggurat algorithm, the lower-left corner $(0, f_{i-1} = P(X_{i-1}))$ begins at $x = 0$ and lies immediately above the previous layer. Also like the traditional algorithm, layers are equal in area and computation is most efficient when the number of layers N_{layers} is 256 (see *Appendix*). However in the modified algorithm, the area of each layer is exactly $1/N_{\text{layers}} = 1/256^{\text{th}}$ of the total volume. With this constraint, we can solve for X_i:

$$1/N_{\text{layers}} = X_i \left(P(X_i) - P(X_{i-1})\right)$$

This iterative equation is solvable numerically using the Bisection Method, and is continually solved until no more layers can be created. The first layer begins with its lower-left corner at the origin $(0, 0)$. Small un-sampled overhangs of probability mass of area $A_i = \int_{X_i}^{X_{i-1}} P(x) - P(X_{i-1})dx$ remain to the right of each layer (Figure 1). These additional areas of probability mass imply that less than N_{layers} rectangular layers will fit beneath $P(x)$. Indeed, the total number of layers $i_{\max}$ cannot be determined until the last layer is calculated, which for an exponential distribution is 252.



Figure 1: **Ziggurat layers in the modified algorithm lie completely beneath $P(x)$.** In the Traditional Ziggurat, layers completely contain the desired distribution, except for the tail. Because these layers are rectangular, they must extend beyond $P(x)$, thus requiring a rejection sampling test in a subset of cases. In the proposed algorithm, layers reside completely beneath $P(x)$. This eliminates the need for a rejection test when sampling from the ziggurat layers. However, small gaps of probability mass, with area A_i, overhang to the right of each layer. These gaps must be sampled in $< 2\%$ of cases, using a rejection test described later.

Like the traditional ziggurat algorithm, the modified algorithm relies on 3 pre-calculated tables. In the modified algorithm, these tables are the lengths of each ziggurat layer X_i, the height of each layer $f_i = P(X_i)$, and the area of each gap to the right of each layer A_i. Both algorithms also rely upon uniform floating-point PRNs $U_1, U_2 \in [0, 1)$ and a uniform integer PRN $i \in [0, 256)$. For the modified ziggurat algorithm, sampling from the overhangs requires an additional PRN integer $j \in [0, i_{\max})$, which is sampled from a non-uniform distribution defined by A. This sampling is accomplished in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ operations using a previously-described algorithm [10].

Table 1 describes in pseudocode the modified ziggurat algorithm alongside the traditional algorithm. In the modified algorithm, if the rectangle chosen is less than $i_{\max}$, then x is immediately drawn and returned—eliminating several operations. For this reason, and because the exceptional case (i.e. progression to the end of the algorithm) is more common in the traditional algorithm, the modified algorithm is faster.

Additional modifications, exploiting the mathematical properties of normal and exponential distributions, can be made to accelerate sampling in the uncommon cases (steps 3-8 in Table 1) where points are sampled from the tail or rejection sampled. Sampling from the tail can be accelerated by noting that the exponential distribution is memoryless, i.e. the tail of an exponential distribution is, itself, an exponential distribution. Hence, values from the tail can be drawn using the ziggurat algorithm recursively. Although the normal distribution is not memoryless, a previously described algorithm, which transforms exponentially-distributed PRNs, can accelerate sampling from the tail [3].

Lastly, rejection sampling can be avoided in most cases even when sampling from the overhanging boxes in an exponential distribution. These boxes can be split into three subspaces: (i) a triangular area exclusively above $P(x)$—note that the exponential distribution has negative curvature everywhere, so any line segment between two points on $P(x) = e^{-x}$ lies completely above $P(x)$; (ii) a triangular area exclusively below $P(x)$, and (iii) a narrow band of area, proximal to the $P(x)$ curve that must still be sampled by rejection (Figure 2). The upper bound for this narrow band is simply the line segment connecting the points $(X_i,\ f_i = P(X_i))$ and $(X_{i+1},\ f_{i+1})$, which is $y = f_i + (x - X_i)(f_{i-1} - f_i)$. The lower bound is defined by considering the

Table 1: Comparison of modified and traditional ziggurat algorithms

Modified algorithm	**Traditional algorithm**
1. Generate U_1, i	1. Generate U_1, i
2. If $i < i_{\max}$, return $U_1 X_i$	2. $x \leftarrow U_1 X_i$
3. Generate j from A	3. If $U_1 < k_i$, return x
4. If $j = 0$, return a value from the tail	4. If $i = 0$, return a value from the tail
5. Generate U_2	5. Generate U_2
6. $x \leftarrow X_j + U_1(X_{j-1} - X_j)$	6. If $(f_{i-1} - f_i)U_2 < P(x)$, return x
7. If $(f_{i-1} - f_i)U_2 < P(x)$, return x	7. Go to 1.
8. Go to 4.	
Operations executed in the common case	
Modified algorithm	**Traditional algorithm**
98.4% probability of exit at step 2.	*97.8% probability of exit at step 3.*
1. Generate U_1	1. Generate U_1
2. Generate i	2. Generate i
3. Compare $i < i_{\max}$	3. Lookup X_i
4. Lookup X_i	4. Multiply $U_1 X_i$
5. Multiply $U_1 X_i$	5. Assign x
	6. Lookup k_i
	7. Compare $U_1 < k_i$

maximum deviation ϵ of $P(x)$ from this upper bound:

$$\epsilon = \max_x \left[f_i + (x - X_i)(f_{i-1} - f_i) - P(x) \right]$$
$$\epsilon = f_{i-1} + \left(\mathrm{Log}(f_i - fi - 1) + X_i \right) (f_i - f_{i-1})$$

Because an exponential distribution is nearly linear over short distances, this deviation is quite small. When $N_{\text{layers}} = 256$, the widest narrow band is still only 9% of the ziggurat box height. Hence, partitioning the overhang boxes into 3 regions eliminates 91% of all rejection tests, further accelerating the algorithm. A few additional incremental speedups are described in the *Appendix*.

3 Implementation

The algorithm was originally implemented in C and then embedded in Python and MATLAB/Octave using wrapper functions that mimic behavior of native functions (see *Appendix* for source code). Lookup tables were calculated in a separate script and then inserted directly into the source code of the C implementation. The uniform PRNG described previously [7] generates an array of uniform PRNs to capitalize on SIMD instructions and maximize speed. I made slight modifications to this code that minimized index checking, minimized function calls, deprecated support for old architectures that this current ziggurat algorithm does not support, and automatically seeds the PRNG using the system time, process ID, and parent process ID. Source code was designed such that this uniform PRNG can be easily substituted.

4 Timings

The modified ziggurat outperforms all other exponentially- and normally-distributed PRNGs. The speedup, or timing of the fastest alternative algorithm divided by this algorithm's speed, was 65% or greater for the various programing environments tested (Figure 3). In the comparison, the median runtime of three trials of generating and aggregating 10^9 PRNs on two different architectures (circa 2012) are presented (Table



Figure 2: **Rejection sampling of ziggurat overhangs in a exponential distribution can be further accelerated.** Consider the overhanging probability masses from Figure 1. Random points (U_x, U_y) within these smaller overhang boxes are sampled by rejection: points below $P(x)$ are returned, while points above $P(x)$ are rejected. Most rejection tests in these overhangs are avoided, further accelerating computation, by partition the overhang boxes into 3 sections: an area where sampling never succeeds $(U_x > 1 - U_y)$, an area where sampling always succeeds $(U_x > 1 - U_y - \epsilon)$, and a small narrow band $(U_y - U_x < \epsilon)$ proximal to $P(x)$, where rejection tests are still necessary.



Figure 3: **The modified ziggurat algorithm outperforms all other algorithms.** Speedup ranged from 65% to $> 1,000\%$, although the most impressive gains occur in programing environments where performance is prioritized less. Functions mimicking native PRNGs in python and the MATLAB/Octave programing environments, allowing seamless installation and integration, are provided (see *Appendix*).

2). In short, the fastest C implementation of this algorithm generates uniform PRNs, transforms them into exponentially-distributed values, and then adds these values to an aggregate sum in less than 10 CPU cycles per iteration.

5 Discussion

Here I present a modified ziggurat algorithm that places ziggurat layers beneath a desired distribution, instead of above the desired distribution. This modification simplifies calculation of exponentially- and normally-distributed PRNs in the common case and, in-conjunction with efficient sampling of the remaining probability mass overhangs, accelerates PRN generation in all cases profiled.

The modified algorithm was implemented for two of the most common probability distributions and in common programing languages used by the scientific computing community. In principle however, the algorithm could be extended to other probability distributions and, of course, other programing languages. The modifications to the ziggurat algorithm presented here should always improve performance in the common cases (i.e. sampling from the layers) for most probability distributions because it only eliminates computational steps (it does not create any additional steps or use alternate operations). Sampling from the overhangs differs in several ways from the traditional algorithm, so it could conceivably slow computation for some probability distributions, but this was not observed here. Because overhang sampling is rare, it tends to have marginal impact on overall efficiency in general.

Many of the properties of ziggurat algorithms that make them the most efficient PRNGs today exploit advantages of modern architectures. Specifically, ziggurat algorithms use cached lookup tables and control flow operations that execute faster today than they would on older CPUs. Alternate algorithms may be best suited for PRNGs on computers lacking these strengths. On the other hand, this algorithm and ziggurat algorithms in general, should become more competitive as greater accuracy is desired. Implementing this

Table 2: Performance of the modified ziggurat algorithm across architectures.

Algorithm	Architecture 1[a,b] (s)	Architecture 2[c] (s)	Average Speedup
exponential.h	2.79	3.37	1.65
Marsaglia & Tsang [3]	4.63	5.56	
normal.h	3.33	4.03	1.83
Doornik [4]	6.19	7.24	
fast_prns:exponential	4.15	5.05	10.3
numpy:exponential[d]	42.8	52.1	
fas_prns:normal	4.42	5.05	8.85
numpy:normal	37.8	46.1	
cdm_exprnd	7.40	8.73	1.99
Matlab R2013a exprnd	16.0	15.9	
cdm_randn	5.73	6.26	2.41
Matlab R2013a randn	14.0	14.8	

[a]Median runtime of three trials of generating and aggregating 10^9 PRNs.
[b] Intel® Core™ i7-3770K 'Ivy Bridge' CPU @ 3.50GHz with 8 MB cache and 32 GB ram. Compiled using gcc 4.6.3 & all optimization flags enabled.
[c]Intel® Core™ i7-2600K 'Sandy Bridge' CPU @ 3.40GHz with 8 MB cache and 16 GB ram. Compiled via gcc 4.4.3 & all optimization flags enabled.
[d]The PRNG provided by the non-native module 'numpy'[11] substantially outperforms the standard library module 'random', so it was used for benchmarking

algorithm to greater precision does not require modifying the code in the common case in any way; only more precise mathematical operations are needed. In contrast, inverse transform sampling algorithms, which do not require lookup tables or control flow, generally require more terms in a polynomial expansion of the transformation function to increase accuracy [12]. Hence, a ziggurat algorithm's speed should be even more competitive for generating PRNs beyond 64-bit precision. Moreover, inverse transform sampling stretches inputed uniform PRNs across a wide range of values in regions where $P(x)$ is small—further reducing accuracy in regions like the tail of a probability distribution. This issue does not arise with rejection sampling, providing another reason to use ziggurat algorithms in high-accuracy applications. In general, the needs and computational resources of a program should be considered before choosing a PRNG.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Nezar Abdennur, Anton Goloborodko, Maxim Imakaev, and Geoff Fudenberg for helpful discussions and comments. This work was supported by the National Cancer Institute under grant U54CA143874.

References

[1] L'Ecuyer P. Testing random number generators. In: Winter Simulation Conference; 1992. p. 305–313.

[2] Marsaglia G, Tsang WW. A fast, easily implemented method for sampling from decreasing or symmetric unimodal density functions. SIAM Journal on scientific and statistical computing. 1984;5(2):349–359.

[3] Marsaglia G, Tsang WW. The ziggurat method for generating random variables. Journal of Statistical Software. 2000;5(8):1–7.

[4] Doornik JA. An improved ziggurat method to generate normal random samples. University of Oxford. 2005;.

[5] Zhang G, Leong PHW, Lee DU, Villasenor JD, Cheung RC, Luk W. Ziggurat-based hardware gaussian random number generator. In: Field Programmable Logic and Applications, 2005. International Conference on. IEEE; 2005. p. 275–280.

[6] Rubin H, Johnson BC. Efficient generation of exponential and normal deviates. Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation. 2006;76(6):509–518.

[7] Saito M, Matsumoto M. Simd-oriented fast mersenne twister: a 128-bit pseudorandom number generator. In: Monte carlo and quasi-monte carlo methods 2006. Springer; 2008. p. 607–622.

[8] Thomas DB, Luk W, Leong PH, Villasenor JD. Gaussian random number generators. ACM Computing Surveys. 2007 Nov;39(4):11–es; Available from: `http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=1287620.1287622`.

[9] de Schryver C, Schmidt D, Wehn N, Korn E, Marxen H, Korn R. A new hardware efficient inversion based random number generator for non-uniform distributions. In: Reconfigurable Computing and FPGAs (ReConFig), 2010 International Conference on. IEEE; 2010. p. 190–195.

[10] Smith WD. How to sample from a probability distribution. 2002 Apr [cited 2014 Mar 24]; Available from: `http://scorevoting.net/WarrenSmithPages/homepage/sampling.ps`.

[11] Jones E, Oliphant T, Peterson P, et al. SciPy: Open source scientific tools for Python. 2001–; Available from: `http://www.scipy.org/`.

[12] Oved I. Computing transcendental functions. 2003 [cited 2014 Mar 24]; Available from: `http://math.arizona.edu/~aprl/teach/iriso/transcend.ps`.

Appendices

A Source code, Installation, & Usage

Can be found at `https://bitbucket.org/cdmcfarland/fast_prng`. The Python package fast_prng is available for automatic installation via the Python Package Index at `https://pypi.python.org/pypi/fast_prng`.

B Demonstration of Quality

To affirm that the above implementation is mathematically correct, a statistical test "qualit_test.c" was created and is provided. This script allows users to sample the raw moments of generated PRNs. The raw moments of a sample are always unbiased estimators of the raw moments of the generating distribution. Therefore, they provide a quick confirmation of the random properties of a distribution. Below is a sample output of the first five raw moments of 10^{12} trial PRNs:

```
Created 1000000000000 exponential distributed pseudo-random numbers...
X1: 1.000001
X2: 2.000004
X3: 6.000014
X4: 24.000048
X5: 119.999965

Created 1000000000000 standard normal distributed pseudo-random numbers...
X1: 0.000000
X2: 1.000001
X3: -0.000002
X4: 3.000009
X5: -0.000041
```

Deviation of these moments from expectation should scale as $1/\sqrt{N}$, i.e. one part in 10^6 for the above test. As this is the magnitude of deviations in the test, these results suggest that the algorithm is as precise as can be reasonably measured.

Rounding errors were avoided by calculating values for the pre-computed lookup tables: X, A, and $f(X)$, to 128-bit precision. Afterwards, these values are rounded to 64-bit precision. Lastly, because this PRNG generates numbers deterministically from a uniform PRN generator, its sequential randomness should be as good as the underlying uniform generator, which was previously demonstrated to be excellent [7]. Hence, the algorithm's sequential randomness is excellent.

C Additional modifications to the algorithm that mildly increased performance[1]

1. Drawing U from a uniformly-distributed integer on the domain $[0, 2^{64})$, for exponential random number generation, and $[-2^{63}, 2^{63})$ for normally random number generation. This strategy of using integers rather than floating-point numbers accelerates the generation of U, and has been described previously [6]. Expanding the range of U by 2^{64} requires multiplying X and f_i by 2^{-64} to retain the same output.

[1] These modifications often swap floating point operations for integer operations and exploit tendencies of compilers. Hence, they may not necessarily increase performance for all architectures/compilers.

2. Sampling $i, j \in [0, 256)$ from the last 8 bits of U, which now resides on the domain $[0, 2^{64})$, also employed previously [3]. Because the last 12 bits of U are squashed when multiplied by a the floating-point values of X_i and f_i (as they have 52-bit mantissas), these bits can be used for alternate purposes without altering output in any way.

3. For normally-distributed PRNs, the exceptional cases (steps 4-8) were executed via a do-while loop.

4. For exponentially-distributed PRNs, the exceptional cases were executed via a tail-recursive function.

5. In the small overhang boxes, values guaranteed to be outside of $P(x)$ in the upper-right half of the box: $U_x > 1 - U_y$, can be transformed to fall in the lower-left halve by swapping variables, i.e. $x \leftarrow 1 - U_y$ and $y \leftarrow U_x$.

D Modifications to the code that did not increase performance

1. Increasing N_{boxes} to 1024.

2. Calculating a table of ϵ_i for every overhang (Figure 2). Instead, a single, maximal possible deviation $\epsilon = \max_i[\epsilon_i]$ was used. This avoids caching a fourth lookup table.

3. Using the multi-operation instruction "fma" present in the C standard library "math.h".

4. Generating single-precision PRNs.